



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/807,767	03/24/2004	Winston Glenn Walker	930108-2027	4289
7590	02/21/2008	EXAMINER		
Ronald R. Santucci Frommer Lawrence & Haug, LLP 745 Fifth Avenue New York, NY 10151		VO, NGUYEN THANH		
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2618		
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		02/21/2008	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/807,767	WALKER ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	Nguyen Vo	2618

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 December 2007.  
 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-79 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) 75-78 is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 1-74 and 79 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) 75-78 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 27 December 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 12/06/2007 has been entered.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
- The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
3. Claims 1-74, 79 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

As to claim 1, the recitation "the step of energizing the receiver" renders the claim indefinite because claim 13 is an apparatus claim, not a method claim.

As to claims 13, 24, 35, 46, 58, they are rejected for similar reason as set forth in claim 13 above.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the

subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

6. Claims 1-3, 7, 12, 24, 26-27, 34, 79 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koleda (5,081,402, cited by examiner).

As to claim 1, Koleda discloses a wireless control system for operating a component at least in part in response to a wireless signal 14 from a remote control device 16 manipulable by a user (see the shade or window remote control system in figure 1), the wireless signal 14 including at least one preamble pulse followed by a data command signal 14 (see figures 2-3, in this case the preamble pulse as claimed reads on the packet pulse 36 containing the three edges 66 as disclosed at column 6 lines 9-10; the command as claimed reads on a command 14 as disclosed at column 6 lines 25-30); the system comprising: at least one wireless receiver 18 associated with the component and configured for processing wireless signal 14, and at least one controller

26 associated with the component and controlling the receiver, the controller causing the receiver to be energized according to an energization paradigm selected from the group consisting of: energizing for a first energized period, then deenergizing for a short period if no preamble signal is detected, then energizing for a second energized period, and then deenergizing, at least if no preamble signal is detected, for period longer than the short period, prior to reenergizing the receiver; energizing for a first time period and then energizing for a second time period after a rest period the length of which ensures detection in at least one of the time periods of a preamble pulse if a preamble has been generated; and energizing the receiver once sometime within a period of a preamble pulse, wherein in the step of energizing the receiver, an activation duration of the receiver is substantially shorter than the period of a preamble pulse (in this case, Koleda reads on the claimed limitation "energizing for a first time period and then energizing for a second time period after a rest period the length of which ensures detection in at least one of the time periods of a preamble pulse if a preamble has been generated". More specifically, see column 3 lines 54-57 for the claimed limitation "energizing for a first time period"; column 4 lines 1-24 for the claimed limitation "a rest period"; column 4 lines 45-53 for the claimed limitation "a second time period after a rest period"; and column 4 line 45 to column 5 line 58 for the claimed limitation "energizing for a second time period after a rest period the length of which ensures detection in at least one of the time periods of a preamble pulse if a preamble has been generated").

Koleda fails to disclose that the wireless remote control system in figure 1 is a radio-frequency (RF) control system. Those skilled in the art, however, would have

recognized that the wireless link 14 in Koleda could also be a RF link without changing the scope and spirit of Koleda's invention. In addition, the examiner takes Official Notice that using a RF link in a remote control system is known in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the wireless link 14 in Koleda such that it is a RF link, in order to increase the controlling range for the shade or window control system in Koleda.

As to claims 2-3, 26-27, Koleda fails to disclose that each preamble pulse 66 has a duty cycle in excess of 50% as in claims 2, 26, and that the RF signal includes at least six pulses as in claims 3, 27. Those skilled in the art, however, would have recognized that the above claimed limitations would not render the claims patentable over Koleda because they would merely depend on the structure of the preamble alone. Other conventional preamble structures could also be used Koleda without changing the scope and spirit of Koleda's invention. In addition, the examiner takes Official Notice that a preamble pulse which has a duty cycle in excess of 50%, and RF signal which includes at least six pulses are known in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the preamble pulse 66 in Koleda as claimed, in order to allow the receiver 18 enough time to detect the preamble pulses 66.

As to claim 7, Koleda further discloses at least one bypass capacitor 32 (see figure 1; column 4 lines 1-24). Koleda, however, fails to disclose that the capacitor 32 has a capacitance of below 500pF as claimed. Those skilled in the art, however, would have recognized that the above claimed limitation would not render the claim patentable

Art Unit: 2618

over Koleda because it would merely depend on how fast the settling time is (see Koleda, column 4 lines 8-15). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the capacitor 32 in Koleda as claimed, in order to minimize the settling time of the receiver.

As to claims 12, 34, see the motor 20 in figure 1 in Koleda. See also column 2 lines 56-61.

As to claim 24, it is rejected for similar reasons as set forth in claim 7. In addition, the recitation "a window covering, awning, security screen, projection screen, lighting system or the like" has not been given patentable weight because the recitation occurs in the preamble. A preamble is generally not accorded any patentable weight where it merely recites the purpose of a process or the intended use of a structure, and where the body of the claim does not depend on the preamble for completeness but, instead, the process steps or structural limitations are able to stand alone. See *In re Hirao*, 535 F.2d 67, 190 USPQ 15 (CCPA 1976) and *Kropa v. Robie*, 187 F.2d 150, 152, 88 USPQ 478, 481 (CCPA 1951). In fact, Koleda does disclose remote control system for controlling a window covering (see column 2 lines 56-61). Koleda further discloses that the wireless signal 14 including at least one preamble pulse followed by a data command signal 14 (see figures 2-3, in this case the preamble pulse as claimed reads on the packet pulse 36 containing the three edges 66 as disclosed at column 6 lines 9-10; the command as claimed reads on a command 14 as disclosed at column 6 lines 25-30). Koleda further discloses that in the step of energizing the receiver, an activation duration of the receiver is substantially shorter than the period of a preamble

Art Unit: 2618

pulse as claimed (see column 4 line 66 to column 13 which discloses that the receiver is activated in a predetermined period of time to detect a first edge 66 of the preamble 36; if the first edge is not detected, then the receiver goes back to sleep mode. Since the period of the preamble pulse comprises three edges as disclosed at column 6 lines 9-10, it is clear that the activation duration of the receiver is substantially shorter than the period of a preamble pulse).

As to claim 79, first of all Koleda does disclose energizing the receiver once sometime within a period of a preamble pulse as claimed (see column 4 line 17 to column 5 line 10 which clearly discloses energizing the receiver once sometime within a period of a preamble pulse 66). Koleda fails to disclose that the activation duration is approximately 80  $\mu$ s when the period of the preamble pulse is approximately 5000  $\mu$ s, as recited in the claim. Those skilled in the art, however, would have recognized that the above difference would not render the claim patentable over Koleda because it would merely depend on how much power one would like to save in his system. It is no doubt that when the activation duration is much smaller than the period of the preamble pulse, power consumption is greatly reduced. However, the probability of not detecting a preamble pulse is high. On the contrary, when the activation duration is not much smaller than the period of the preamble pulse, power consumption is not greatly reduced. However, the probability of not detecting a preamble pulse is very low. For that reason, if one's priority is power consumption, then he would design his system such that the activation duration (80  $\mu$ s) is much smaller than the period of the preamble pulse (5000  $\mu$ s); and if one's priority is not missing any preamble pulse, then he would

design his system such that the activation duration is not smaller than the period of the preamble pulse. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Koleda as claimed, in order to further reduce the power consumption.

7. Claims 4, 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koleda in view of Langlais (US 2003/0215032 A1, cited by examiner).

As to claims 4, 28, Koleda fails to disclose a fast filer and a slow filter as claimed. Langlais discloses disclose a fast filer 406 and a slow filter 408 (see figure 4) each electrically interposed between a receiver (232, 245. See figure 3) and a controller (360, 368). See also paragraphs [0037]-[0038]. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the above teaching of Langlais to Koleda, in order to properly detect presence of a signal (as suggested by Langlais at paragraphs [0037]-[0038]).

8. Claims 5-6, 13-16, 18, 23, 29-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koleda in view of Yu (US 6,735,454 B1, cited by examiner).

As to claims 5, 29, Koleda fails to disclose operating at a low frequency clock during at least most of the long period and at a high clock frequency at least when the receiver is energized as claimed. Yu discloses operating at a low frequency clock during at least most of the long period and at a high clock frequency at least when the receiver is energized (see column 5 line 29 to column 6 line 18). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to

provide the above teaching of Yu to Koleda, in order to further reduce the power consumption of the battery (as suggested by Yu at column 5 lines 45-51).

As to claims 6, 14, 30, the combination of Koleda and Yu further discloses the claimed limitation (see Yu, column 5 line 64 to column 6 line 18).

As to claim 13, it is rejected for similar reasons as set forth in claim 5. In addition, the recitation "a window covering, awning, security screen, projection screen, lighting system or the like" has not been given patentable weight because the recitation occurs in the preamble. A preamble is generally not accorded any patentable weight where it merely recites the purpose of a process or the intended use of a structure, and where the body of the claim does not depend on the preamble for completeness but, instead, the process steps or structural limitations are able to stand alone. See *In re Hirao*, 535 F.2d 67, 190 USPQ 15 (CCPA 1976) and *Kropa v. Robie*, 187 F.2d 150, 152, 88 USPQ 478, 481 (CCPA 1951). In fact, Koleda does disclose remote control system for controlling a window covering (see column 2 lines 56-61). Koleda further discloses that the wireless signal 14 including at least one preamble pulse followed by a data command signal 14 (see figures 2-3, in this case the preamble pulse as claimed reads on the packet pulse 36 containing the three edges 66 as disclosed at column 6 lines 9-10; the command as claimed reads on a command 14 as disclosed at column 6 lines 25-30). Koleda further discloses that in the step of energizing the receiver, an activation duration of the receiver is substantially shorter than the period of a preamble pulse as claimed (see column 4 line 66 to column 13 which discloses that the receiver is activated in a predetermined period of time to detect a first edge 66 of the preamble 36;

Art Unit: 2618

if the first edge is not detected, then the receiver goes back to sleep mode.. Since the period of the preamble pulse comprises three edges as disclosed at column 6 lines 9-10, it is clear that the activation duration of the receiver is substantially shorter than the period of a preamble pulse).

As to claims 15-16, Koleda as modified by Yu fails to disclose that the plural pulses 66 has a duty cycle in excess of 50% as in claim 15, and include at least six pulses as in claim 16. Those skilled in the art, however, would have recognized that the above claimed limitations would not render the claims patentable over Koleda because they would merely depend on the structure of the preamble alone. Other conventional preamble structures could also be used Koleda without changing the scope and spirit of Koleda's invention. In addition, the examiner takes Official Notice that a preamble signal which has a duty cycle in excess of 50%, and include at least six pulses is known in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the preamble pulse 66 in Koleda as claimed, in order to allow the receiver 18 enough time to detect the preamble pulses 66.

As to claim 18, Koleda further discloses at least one bypass capacitor 32 (see figure 1; column 4 lines 1-24). Koleda, however, fails to disclose that the capacitor 32 has a capacitance of below 500pF as claimed. Those skilled in the art, however, would have recognized that the above claimed limitation would not render the claim patentable over Koleda because it would merely depend on how fast the settling time is (see Koleda, column 4 lines 8-15). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary

Art Unit: 2618

skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the capacitor 32 in Koleda as claimed, in order to minimize the settling time of the receiver.

As to claim 23, see the motor 20 in figure 1 in Koleda. See also column 2 lines 56-61.

9. Claims 8, 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koleda in view of Pace (5,471,665, cited by examiner).

As to claims 8, 25, Koleda does disclose one bypass capacitor 32 (see figure 1), but fails to disclose plural bypass capacitors as claimed. Pace discloses a plural bypass capacitors (see column 4 lines 30-40). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the above teaching of Pace to Koleda, in order to obtain a much faster warm up time (as suggested by Pace at column 4 lines 34-38).

Still as to claims 8, 25, the combination of Koleda and Pace fails to disclose at least one capacitance not more than 100pF as claimed. Those skilled in the art, however, would have recognized that the above claimed limitation would not render the claim patentable over Koleda because it would merely depend on how fast the settling time is (see Koleda, column 4 lines 8-15). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the capacitor 32 in Koleda as claimed, in order to minimize the settling time of the receiver.

10. Claims 9, 31, 35, 37-38, 42, 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koleda in view of Terreault (6,058,292, cited by examiner).

As to claims 9, 31, Koleda fails to disclose at least one SAW as claimed.

Terreault discloses a SAW resonator circuit 60 for establishing an IF oscillator 24 for a receiver (see column 4 lines 5-14). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the above teaching of Terreault to Koleda, in order to increase the start up time.

As to claim 35, it is rejected for similar reasons as set forth in claim 9 above. In addition, the recitation "a window covering, awning, security screen, projection screen, lighting system or the like" has not been given patentable weight because the recitation occurs in the preamble. A preamble is generally not accorded any patentable weight where it merely recites the purpose of a process or the intended use of a structure, and where the body of the claim does not depend on the preamble for completeness but, instead, the process steps or structural limitations are able to stand alone. See *In re Hirao*, 535 F.2d 67, 190 USPQ 15 (CCPA 1976) and *Kropa v. Robie*, 187 F.2d 150, 152, 88 USPQ 478, 481 (CCPA 1951). In fact, Koleda does disclose remote control system for controlling a window covering (see column 2 lines 56-61). Koleda further discloses that the wireless signal 14 including at least one preamble pulse followed by a data command signal 14 (see figures 2-3, in this case the preamble pulse as claimed reads on the packet pulse 36 containing the three edges 66 as disclosed at column 6 lines 9-10; the command as claimed reads on a command 14 as disclosed at column 6 lines 25-30). Koleda further discloses that in the step of energizing the receiver, an activation duration of the receiver is substantially shorter than the period of a preamble pulse as claimed (see column 4 line 66 to column 13 which discloses that the receiver is

activated in a predetermined period of time to detect a first edge 66 of the preamble 36; if the first edge is not detected, then the receiver goes back to sleep mode. Since the period of the preamble pulse comprises three edges as disclosed at column 6 lines 9-10, it is clear that the activation duration of the receiver is substantially shorter than the period of a preamble pulse).

As to claims 37-38, Koleda fails to disclose that the plural pulses 66 has a duty cycle in excess of 50% as in claim 37, and include at least six pulses as in claim 38. Those skilled in the art, however, would have recognized that the above claimed limitations would not render the claims patentable over Koleda because they would merely depend on the structure of the preamble alone. Other conventional preamble structures could also be used Koleda without changing the scope and spirit of Koleda's invention. In addition, the examiner takes Official Notice that a preamble signal which has a duty cycle in excess of 50%, and include at least six pulses is known in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the preamble pulse 66 in Koleda as claimed, in order to allow the receiver 18 enough time to detect the preamble pulses 66.

As to claim 42, Koleda further discloses at least one bypass capacitor 32 (see figure 1; column 4 lines 1-24). Koleda, however, fails to disclose that the capacitor 32 has a capacitance of below 500pF as claimed. Those skilled in the art, however, would have recognized that the above claimed limitation would not render the claim patentable over Koleda because it would merely depend on how fast the settling time is (see Koleda, column 4 lines 8-15). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary

skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the capacitor 32 in Koleda as claimed, in order to minimize the settling time of the receiver.

As to claim 45, see the motor 20 in figure 1 in Koleda. See also column 2 lines 56-61.

11. Claims 10, 32, 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koleda in view of Terreault (6,058,292, cited by examiner) and Panther (5,537,676, cited by examiner).

As to claims 10, 32, 36, the combination of Koleda and Terreault fails to disclose an LC filter for filtering an IF signal as claimed. Panther discloses an LC filter 41 for filtering an IF signal (see column 3 lines 39-45). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the above teaching of Panther to the combination of Koleda and Terreault, in order to reduce the implementing cost of the receiver 18 (as suggested by Panther at column 3 lines 40-45).

12. Claims 11, 33, 46-48, 52, 56-57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koleda in view of Tanaka (5,636,243, cited by examiner).

As to claims 11, 33, Koleda fails to disclose a DC-DC down converter as claimed. Tanaka discloses a DC-DC converter 318 electrically interposed between a battery 317 and receiver (see the receiver in figure 6) to provide voltage to the receiver (see column 4 lines 32-37). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the above teaching of Tanaka to Koleda, so that the receiver could be supplied with a desired voltage level (as suggested by Tanaka at column 4 lines 32-37).

As to claim 46, it is rejected for similar reasons as set forth in claim 11 above. In addition, the recitation "a window covering, awning, security screen, projection screen, lighting system or the like" has not been given patentable weight because the recitation occurs in the preamble. A preamble is generally not accorded any patentable weight where it merely recites the purpose of a process or the intended use of a structure, and where the body of the claim does not depend on the preamble for completeness but, instead, the process steps or structural limitations are able to stand alone. See *In re Hirao*, 535 F.2d 67, 190 USPQ 15 (CCPA 1976) and *Kropa v. Robie*, 187 F.2d 150, 152, 88 USPQ 478, 481 (CCPA 1951). In fact, Koleda does disclose remote control system for controlling a window covering (see column 2 lines 56-61). Koleda further discloses that the wireless signal 14 including at least one preamble pulse followed by a data command signal 14 (see figures 2-3, in this case the preamble pulse as claimed reads on the packet pulse 36 containing the three edges 66 as disclosed at column 6 lines 9-10; the command as claimed reads on a command 14 as disclosed at column 6 lines 25-30). Koleda further discloses that in the step of energizing the receiver, an activation duration of the receiver is substantially shorter than the period of a preamble pulse as claimed (see column 4 line 66 to column 13 which discloses that the receiver is activated in a predetermined period of time to detect a first edge 66 of the preamble 36; if the first edge is not detected, then the receiver goes back to sleep mode. Since the period of the preamble pulse comprises three edges as disclosed at column 6 lines 9-10, it is clear that the activation duration of the receiver is substantially shorter than the period of a preamble pulse).

As to claims 47-48, Koleda fails to disclose that the plural pulses 66 has a duty cycle in excess of 50% as in claim 47, and include at least six pulses as in claim 48. Those skilled in the art, however, would have recognized that the above claimed limitations would not render the claims patentable over Koleda because they would merely depend on the structure of the preamble alone. Other conventional preamble structures could also be used Koleda without changing the scope and spirit of Koleda's invention. In addition, the examiner takes Official Notice that a preamble signal which has a duty cycle in excess of 50%, and include at least six pulses is known in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the preamble pulse 66 in Koleda as claimed, in order to allow the receiver 18 enough time to detect the preamble pulses 66.

As to claim 52, Koleda further discloses at least one bypass capacitor 32 (see figure 1; column 4 lines 1-24). Koleda, however, fails to disclose that the capacitor 32 has a capacitance of below 500pF as claimed. Those skilled in the art, however, would have recognized that the above claimed limitation would not render the claim patentable over Koleda because it would merely depend on how fast the settling time is (see Koleda, column 4 lines 8-15). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the capacitor 32 in Koleda as claimed, in order to minimize the settling time of the receiver.

As to claim 56, it is rejected for similar reasons as set forth in claim 11 above.

As to claim 57, see the motor 20 in figure 1 in Koleda. See also column 2 lines 56-61.

13. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koleda in view of Yu and further in view of Langlais (US 2003/0215032 A1, cited by examiner).

As to claim 17, Koleda as modified by Yu fails to disclose a fast filer and a slow filter as claimed. Langlais discloses disclose a fast filer 406 and a slow filter 408 (see figure 4) each electrically interposed between a receiver (232, 245. See figure 3)) and a controller (360, 368). See also paragraphs [0037]-[0038]. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the above teaching of Langlais to Koleda, in order to properly detect presence of a signal (as suggested by Langlais at paragraphs [0037]-[0038]).

14. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koleda in view of Yu and further in view of Pace (5,471,665, cited by examiner).

As to claim 19, Koleda as modified by Yu does disclose one bypass capacitor 32 (see figure 1), but fails to disclose plural bypass capacitors as claimed. Pace discloses a plural bypass capacitors (see column 4 lines 30-40). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the above teaching of Pace to Koleda, in order to obtain a much faster warm up time (as suggested by Pace at column 4 lines 34-38).

Still as to claim 19, the combination of Koleda and Pace fails to disclose at least one capacitance not more than 100pF as claimed. Those skilled in the art, however, would have recognized that the above claimed limitation would not render the claim patentable over Koleda because it would merely depend on how fast the settling time is (see Koleda, column 4 lines 8-15). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the capacitor 32 in Koleda as claimed, in order to minimize the settling time of the receiver.

15. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koleda in view of Yu and further in view of Terreault (6,058,292, cited by examiner).

As to claim 20, Koleda as modified by Yu fails to disclose at least one SAW as claimed. Terreault discloses a SAW resonator circuit 60 for establishing an IF oscillator 24 for a receiver (see column 4 lines 5-14). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the above teaching of Terreault to Koleda, in order to increase the start up time.

16. Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koleda in view of Yu and Terreault (6,058,292, cited by examiner) and further in view of Panther (5,537,676, cited by examiner).

As to claim 21, the combination of Koleda and Yu and Terreault fails to disclose an LC filter for filtering an IF signal as claimed. Panther discloses an LC filter 41 for filtering an IF signal (see column 3 lines 39-45). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the above teaching of Panther to the combination of Koleda and Terreault, in order to reduce the implementing cost of the receiver 18 (as suggested by Panther at column 3 lines 40-45).

17. Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koleda in view of Yu and further in view of Tanaka (5,636,243, cited by examiner).

As to claim 22, Koleda as modified by Yu fails to disclose a DC-DC down converter as claimed. Tanaka discloses a DC-DC converter 318 electrically interposed

between a battery 317 and receiver (see the receiver in figure 6) to provide voltage to the receiver (see column 4 lines 32-37). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the above teaching of Tanaka to Koleda, so that the receiver could be supplied with a desired voltage level (as suggested by Tanaka at column 4 lines 32-37).

18. Claim 39 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koleda in view of Terreault and further in view of Langlais (US 2003/0215032 A1, cited by examiner).

As to claim 39, Koleda as modified by Terreault fails to disclose a fast filer and a slow filter as claimed. Langlais discloses disclose a fast filer 406 and a slow filter 408 (see figure 4) each electrically interposed between a receiver (232, 245. See figure 3)) and a controller (360, 368). See also paragraphs [0037]-[0038]. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the above teaching of Langlais to Koleda, in order to properly detect presence of a signal (as suggested by Langlais at paragraphs [0037]-[0038]).

19. Claims 40-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koleda in view Terreault and further in view of Yu (US 6,735,454 B1, cited by examiner).

As to claim 40, Koleda as modified by Terreault fails to disclose operating at a low frequency clock during at least most of the long period and at a high clock frequency at least when the receiver is energized as claimed. Yu discloses operating at a low frequency clock during at least most of the long period and at a high clock

frequency at least when the receiver is energized (see column 5 line 29 to column 6 line 18). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the above teaching of Yu to Koleda, in order to further reduce the power consumption of the battery (as suggested by Yu at column 5 lines 45-51).

As to claim 41, the combination of Koleda and Yu further discloses the claimed limitation (see Yu, column 5 line 64 to column 6 line 18).

20. Claim 43 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koleda in view of Terreault and further in view of Pace (5,471,665, cited by examiner).

As to claim 43, Koleda does disclose one bypass capacitor 32 (see figure 1), but fails to disclose plural bypass capacitors as claimed. Pace discloses a plural bypass capacitors (see column 4 lines 30-40). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the above teaching of Pace to Koleda, in order to obtain a much faster warm up time (as suggested by Pace at column 4 lines 34-38).

Still as to claim 43, the combination of Koleda, Terreault and Pace fails to disclose at least one capacitance not more than 100pF as claimed. Those skilled in the art, however, would have recognized that the above claimed limitation would not render the claim patentable over Koleda because it would merely depend on how fast the settling time is (see Koleda, column 4 lines 8-15). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the capacitor 32 in Koleda as claimed, in order to minimize the settling time of the receiver.

Art Unit: 2618

21. Claim 44 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koleda in view of Terreault and further in view of Tanaka (5,636,243, cited by examiner).

As to claim 44, Koleda as modified by Terreault fails to disclose a DC-DC down converter as claimed. Tanaka discloses a DC-DC converter 318 electrically interposed between a battery 317 and receiver (see the receiver in figure 6) to provide voltage to the receiver (see column 4 lines 32-37). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the above teaching of Tanaka to Koleda, so that the receiver could be supplied with a desired voltage level (as suggested by Tanaka at column 4 lines 32-37).

22. Claim 49 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koleda in view of Tanaka and further in view of Langlais (US 2003/0215032 A1, cited by examiner).

As to claim 49, Koleda as modified by Tanaka fails to disclose a fast filer and a slow filter as claimed. Langlais discloses disclose a fast filer 406 and a slow filter 408 (see figure 4) each electrically interposed between a receiver (232, 245. See figure 3)) and a controller (360, 368). See also paragraphs [0037]-[0038]. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the above teaching of Langlais to Koleda, in order to properly detect presence of a signal (as suggested by Langlais at paragraphs [0037]-[0038]).

23. Claims 50-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koleda in view Tanaka and further in view of Yu (US 6,735,454 B1, cited by examiner).

As to claim 50, Koleda as modified by Tanaka fails to disclose operating at a low frequency clock during at least most of the long period and at a high clock frequency at least when the receiver is energized as claimed. Yu discloses operating at a low frequency clock during at least most of the long period and at a high clock frequency at least when the receiver is energized (see column 5 line 29 to column 6 line 18). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the above teaching of Yu to Koleda, in order to further reduce the power consumption of the battery (as suggested by Yu at column 5 lines 45-51).

As to claim 51, the combination of Koleda and Yu further discloses the claimed limitation (see Yu, column 5 line 64 to column 6 line 18).

24. Claim 53 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koleda in view of Tanaka and further in view of Pace (5,471,665, cited by examiner).

As to claim 53, Koleda as modified by Tanaka does disclose one bypass capacitor 32 (see figure 1), but fails to disclose plural bypass capacitors as claimed. Pace discloses a plural bypass capacitors (see column 4 lines 30-40). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the above teaching of Pace to Koleda, in order to obtain a much faster warm up time (as suggested by Pace at column 4 lines 34-38).

Still as to claim 53, the combination of Koleda and Pace fails to disclose at least one capacitance not more than 100pF as claimed. Those skilled in the art, however, would have recognized that the above claimed limitation would not render the claim patentable over Koleda because it would merely depend on how fast the settling time is

(see Koleda, column 4 lines 8-15). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the capacitor 32 in Koleda as claimed, in order to minimize the settling time of the receiver.

25. Claim 54 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koleda in view of Tanaka and further in view of Terreault (6,058,292, cited by examiner).

As to claim 54, Koleda as modified by Tanaka fails to disclose at least one SAW as claimed. Terreault discloses a SAW resonator circuit 60 for establishing an IF oscillator 24 for a receiver (see column 4 lines 5-14). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the above teaching of Terreault to Koleda, in order to increase the start up time.

26. Claim 55 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koleda in view of Tanaka and Terreault (6,058,292, cited by examiner) and further in view of Panther (5,537,676, cited by examiner).

As to claim 55, the combination of Koleda and Tanaka and Terreault fails to disclose an LC filter for filtering an IF signal as claimed. Panther discloses an LC filter 41 for filtering an IF signal (see column 3 lines 39-45). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the above teaching of Panther to the combination of Koleda and Terreault, in order to reduce the implementing cost of the receiver 18 (as suggested by Panther at column 3 lines 40-45).

27. Claims 58, 60-61, 63, 68, 69, 71 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koleda in view of Naidu (6,128,470, cited by examiner).

As to claims 58, 69, 71, first of all the rejection to claim 1 over Koleda as set forth above is herein incorporated. Koleda fails to disclose adaptively adjusting a noise threshold above which a carrier must be detected to indicate the presence of a control signal as claimed. Naidu discloses adaptively adjusting a noise threshold above which a carrier must be detected to indicate the presence of a control signal (see column 5 lines 28-46). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the above teaching of Naidu to Koleda, in order to properly determine a presence of a control signal (as suggested by Naidu at column 5 lines 28-34).

Still as to claim 58, the recitation "a window covering, awning, security screen, projection screen, lighting system or the like" has not been given patentable weight because the recitation occurs in the preamble. A preamble is generally not accorded any patentable weight where it merely recites the purpose of a process or the intended use of a structure, and where the body of the claim does not depend on the preamble for completeness but, instead, the process steps or structural limitations are able to stand alone. See *In re Hirao*, 535 F.2d 67, 190 USPQ 15 (CCPA 1976) and *Kropa v. Robie*, 187 F.2d 150, 152, 88 USPQ 478, 481 (CCPA 1951). In fact, Koleda does disclose remote control system for controlling a window covering (see column 2 lines 56-61). Koleda further discloses that the wireless signal 14 including at least one preamble pulse followed by a data command signal 14 (see figures 2-3, in this case the preamble pulse as claimed reads on the packet pulse 36 containing the three edges 66 as disclosed at column 6 lines 9-10; the command as claimed reads on a command 14

Art Unit: 2618

as disclosed at column 6 lines 25-30). Koleda further discloses that in the step of energizing the receiver, an activation duration of the receiver is substantially shorter than the period of a preamble pulse as claimed (see column 4 line 66 to column 13 which discloses that the receiver is activated in a predetermined period of time to detect a first edge 66 of the preamble 36; if the first edge is not detected, then the receiver goes back to sleep mode. Since the period of the preamble pulse comprises three edges as disclosed at column 6 lines 9-10, it is clear that the activation duration of the receiver is substantially shorter than the period of a preamble pulse).

As to claims 60-61, Koleda fails to disclose that the plural pulses 66 has a duty cycle in excess of 50% as in claim 60, and include at least six pulses as in claim 61. Those skilled in the art, however, would have recognized that the above claimed limitations would not render the claims patentable over Koleda because they would merely depend on the structure of the preamble alone. Other conventional preamble structures could also be used Koleda without changing the scope and spirit of Koleda's invention. In addition, the examiner takes Official Notice that a preamble signal which has a duty cycle in excess of 50%, and include at least six pulses is known in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the preamble pulse 66 in Koleda as claimed, in order to allow the receiver 18 enough time to detect the preamble pulses 66.

As to claim 63, Koleda further discloses at least one bypass capacitor 32 (see figure 1; column 4 lines 1-24). Koleda, however, fails to disclose that the capacitor 32 has a capacitance of below 500pF as claimed. Those skilled in the art, however, would

Art Unit: 2618

have recognized that the above claimed limitation would not render the claim patentable over Koleda because it would merely depend on how fast the settling time is (see Koleda, column 4 lines 8-15). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the capacitor 32 in Koleda as claimed, in order to minimize the settling time of the receiver.

As to claim 68, see the motor 20 in figure 1 in Koleda. See also column 2 lines 56-61.

28. Claim 59 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koleda in view Naidu and further in view of Yu (US 6,735,454 B1, cited by examiner).

As to claim 59, Koleda as modified by Naidu fails to disclose operating at an intermediate frequency between a low frequency clock and a high frequency clock as claimed. Yu discloses operating at an intermediate frequency between a low frequency clock and a high frequency clock (see column 5 line 29 to column 6 line 18). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the above teaching of Yu to Koleda, in order to further reduce the power consumption of the battery (as suggested by Yu at column 5 lines 45-51).

29. Claim 62 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koleda in view of Naidu and further in view of Langlais (US 2003/0215032 A1, cited by examiner).

As to claim 62, Koleda as modified by Naidu fails to disclose a fast filer and a slow filter as claimed. Langlais discloses disclose a fast filer 406 and a slow filter 408 (see figure 4) each electrically interposed between a receiver (232, 245. See figure 3))

Art Unit: 2618

and a controller (360, 368). See also paragraphs [0037]-[0038]. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the above teaching of Langlais to Koleda, in order to properly detect presence of a signal (as suggested by Langlais at paragraphs [0037]-[0038]).

30. Claim 64 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koleda in view of Naidu and further in view of Pace (5,471,665, cited by examiner).

As to claim 64, Koleda does disclose one bypass capacitor 32 (see figure 1), but fails to disclose plural bypass capacitors as claimed. Pace discloses a plural bypass capacitors (see column 4 lines 30-40). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the above teaching of Pace to Koleda, in order to obtain a much faster warm up time (as suggested by Pace at column 4 lines 34-38).

Still as to claim 64, the combination of Koleda and Pace fails to disclose at least one capacitance not more than 100pF as claimed. Those skilled in the art, however, would have recognized that the above claimed limitation would not render the claim patentable over Koleda because it would merely depend on how fast the settling time is (see Koleda, column 4 lines 8-15). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the capacitor 32 in Koleda as claimed, in order to minimize the settling time of the receiver.

31. Claim 65 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koleda in view of Naidu and further in view of Terreault (6,058,292, cited by examiner).

As to claim 65, Koleda as modified by Naidu fails to disclose at least one SAW as claimed. Terreault discloses a SAW resonator circuit 60 for establishing an IF oscillator 24 for a receiver (see column 4 lines 5-14). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the above teaching of Terreault to Koleda, in order to increase the start up time.

32. Claim 66 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koleda in view of Naidu and Terreault (6,058,292, cited by examiner) and further in view of Panther (5,537,676, cited by examiner).

As to claim 66, the combination of Koleda and Naidu and Terreault fails to disclose an LC filter for filtering an IF signal as claimed. Panther discloses an LC filter 41 for filtering an IF signal (see column 3 lines 39-45). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the above teaching of Panther to the combination of Koleda and Naidu and Terreault, in order to reduce the implementing cost of the receiver 18 (as suggested by Panther at column 3 lines 40-45).

33. Claim 67 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koleda in view of Naidu and further in view of Tanaka (5,636,243, cited by examiner).

As to claim 67, Koleda as modified by Naidu fails to disclose a DC-DC down converter as claimed. Tanaka discloses a DC-DC converter 318 electrically interposed between a battery 317 and receiver (see the receiver in figure 6) to provide voltage to the receiver (see column 4 lines 32-37). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the above teaching of

Tanaka to Koleda, so that the receiver could be supplied with a desired voltage level (as suggested by Tanaka at column 4 lines 32-37).

34. Claim 70 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koleda in view of Yu and further in view of Naidu (6,128,470, cited by examiner).

As to claim 70, first of all the rejection to claim 1 over Koleda as set forth above is herein incorporated. Koleda fails to disclose adaptively adjusting a noise threshold above which a carrier must be detected to indicate the presence of a control signal as claimed. Naidu discloses adaptively adjusting a noise threshold above which a carrier must be detected to indicate the presence of a control signal (see column 5 lines 28-46). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the above teaching of Naidu to Koleda, in order to properly determine a presence of a control signal (as suggested by Naidu at column 5 lines 28-34).

35. Claim 72 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koleda in view of Terreault and further in view of Naidu (6,128,470, cited by examiner).

As to claim 72, first of all the rejection to claim 1 over Koleda as set forth above is herein incorporated. Koleda fails to disclose adaptively adjusting a noise threshold above which a carrier must be detected to indicate the presence of a control signal as claimed. Naidu discloses adaptively adjusting a noise threshold above which a carrier must be detected to indicate the presence of a control signal (see column 5 lines 28-46). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the above teaching of Naidu to Koleda, in order to properly

Art Unit: 2618

determine a presence of a control signal (as suggested by Naidu at column 5 lines 28-34).

36. Claim 73 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koleda in view of Tanaka and further in view of Naidu (6,128,470, cited by examiner).

As to claim 73, first of all the rejection to claim 1 over Koleda as set forth above is herein incorporated. Koleda fails to disclose adaptively adjusting a noise threshold above which a carrier must be detected to indicate the presence of a control signal as claimed. Naidu discloses adaptively adjusting a noise threshold above which a carrier must be detected to indicate the presence of a control signal (see column 5 lines 28-46). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the above teaching of Naidu to Koleda, in order to properly determine a presence of a control signal (as suggested by Naidu at column 5 lines 28-34).

37. Claim 74 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koleda in view of Hunzinger (6,829,493, cited by examiner).

As to claim 74, first of all the rejection to claim 1 over Koleda as set forth above is herein incorporated. Koleda fails to disclose energizing for a first energized period, then deenergizing for a short period if no preamble signal is detected, then energizing for a second energized period, and then deenergizing, at least if no preamble signal is detected, for period longer than the short period, prior to reenergizing the receiver. Such teaching is taught by Hunzinger (see column 1 lines 61-65). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to

provide the above teaching of Hunzinger to Koleda, in order to further reduce the battery consumption (as suggested by Hunzinger).

***Response to Arguments***

38. Applicant's arguments filed 12/06/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

**Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph:**

The examiner finds applicant's arguments persuasive. Accordingly, the rejection to claims under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph is now withdrawn.

**Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a):**

Regarding claim 1, applicant argues that the examiner fails to address the limitation "in the step of energizing the receiver, an activation duration of the receiver is substantially shorter than the period of a preamble pulse". The examiner, however, disagrees. The above claimed limitation is not addressed because it is not positively recited in the claim. Claim 1 includes alternative language "the controller causing the receiver to be energized according to an energization paradigm **selected from the group consisting of**". Accordingly, only one of the limitations after the alternative language "**selected from the group consisting of**" needs to be addressed. As clearly stated in the rejection to claim 1, Koleda reads on the claimed limitation "energizing for a first time period and then energizing for a second time period after a rest period the length of which ensures detection in at least one of the time periods of a preamble pulse if a preamble has been generated". More specifically, see column 3 lines 54-57 for the claimed limitation "energizing for a first time period"; column 4 lines 1-24 for the claimed

limitation "a rest period"; column 4 lines 45-53 for the claimed limitation "a second time period after a rest period"; and column 4 line 45 to column 5 line 58 for the claimed limitation "energizing for a second time period after a rest period the length of which ensures detection in at least one of the time periods of a preamble pulse if a preamble has been generated".

Regarding the examiner's reasons on page 6 with respect to claim 79 of the Office Action mailed on 09/10/2007, applicant argues that the instant invention results in a combination of both, reduction in power consumption as well as reduction in the probability of missing any preamble pulse. In response, the examiner believes that Koleda also results in a combination of both, reduction in power consumption (see column 6 lines 52-54) as well as reduction in the probability of missing any preamble pulse (see column 6 lines 48-55).

Regarding claim 24, it is discussed for similar reasons as set forth in claim 1 above.

Regarding Yu, Terreault, Tanaka, Naidu, applicant argues that there is no suggestion to combine the above references with Koleda because none of the above cited references relate to a radio-frequency control system for controlling a component of a window covering, awning, security screen, projection screen, lighting system or the like. The examiner, however, disagrees. The above cited references Yu, Terreault, Tanaka, Naidu are not required to be related to a radio-frequency control system for controlling a component of a window covering, awning, security screen, projection screen, lighting system or the like, in order to be combinable with Koleda. In this case,

each of cited references Yu, Terreault, Tanaka, Naidu discloses components in radio/wireless receivers which are properly can be used in the wireless receiver of Koleda.

Applicant further argues that none of the cited references Yu, Terreault, Tanaka, Naidu discloses the above identified deficiency in Koleda, namely, "wherein in the step of energizing the receiver, an activation duration of the receiver is substantially shorter than the period of a preamble pulse". As discussed above, The above claimed limitation is not addressed because it is not positively recited in the claim. Claim 1 includes alternative language "the controller causing the receiver to be energized according to an energization paradigm **selected from the group consisting of**". Accordingly, only one of the limitations after the alternative language "**selected from the group consisting of**" needs to be addressed. As clearly stated in the rejection to claim 1, Koleda reads on the claimed limitation "energizing for a first time period and then energizing for a second time period after a rest period the length of which ensures detection in at least one of the time periods of a preamble pulse if a preamble has been generated". More specifically, see column 3 lines 54-57 for the claimed limitation "energizing for a first time period"; column 4 lines 1-24 for the claimed limitation "a rest period"; column 4 lines 45-53 for the claimed limitation "a second time period after a rest period"; and column 4 line 45 to column 5 line 58 for the claimed limitation "energizing for a second time period after a rest period the length of which ensures detection in at least one of the time periods of a preamble pulse if a preamble has been generated".

For the foregoing reasons, the examiner contends that the rejections to claims are proper.

***Conclusion***

39. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Nagamoto (5,446,453) discloses **in the step of energizing the receiver, an activation duration of the receiver is substantially shorter than the period of a preamble pulse**" (see column 9 lines 16-24).

40. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nguyen Vo whose telephone number is (571) 272-7901. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edward Urban can be reached on (571) 272-7899. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Nguyen Vo  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 2618

Nguyen Vo  
2-18-2008